

SINGLE MEMBER OF THE REGULATORY TRIBUNAL DECISION SHEET

RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2022

Part VI, Regulatory Tribunal Single Member Decision

Regulated Member: Vishal Kamle - Membership number 6899712

Single Member Decision of: Paul Curtis

Case Number: Reg 0000049099

Date of Decision: 15th September 2026

CHARGE :

The allegation against the Regulated Member is:

On 19 May 2025 at Central London Magistrates' Court, Mr Vishal Kamle was convicted of the following offences:

- i) On 4 May 2025, when suspected of having driven a vehicle and having been required to provide a specimen or specimens of breath for analysis, failed without reasonable excuse to do so contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and*
- ii) On 4 May 2025, used a motor vehicle on a road or other public place when there was not in force in relation to that use such a policy of insurance as complied with the requirements of Part VI of the Road Traffic Act 1988 contrary to Section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988.*

Vishal Kamle is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-law 5.2.2(d)

MATERIALS CONSIDERED

In assessing this case I have considered:

A Hearing bundle comprised of 74 pages including the following material

- RICS Investigation report
- Self reporting of the conviction by Mr Kamle
- A statement from Nicola Chandler dated 27th March 2026 producing exhibits including

- a. Notice of disqualification from driving
- b. Community Order dated 19th June
- c. Certificate of completion of Unpaid Work dated 2nd September 2025
- An undated personal statement from Mr Karmle in response to an E mail dated 27th May 2026 from Nicola Chandler
- Two character testimonials from a Samuel Bensusan MRICS, and Karram Singh MRICS in respect of Mr Karmle.
- A schedule of costs prepared by RICS

BACKGROUND

On 4 May 2025 Mr Kamle was convicted of one count of driving a vehicle on a road and failing to supply a specimen for analysis when required to do so contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, and one count of using a vehicle uninsured against third party risks contrary to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

The Member was sentenced on 19th June 2025 when he received a driving disqualification for a period of 28-months and a Community Order requiring 200 hours of unpaid work to be completed within a year of conviction. The Member's driving licence was also endorsed. The member completed his unpaid work in 3 months.

The member did not report the fact of the conviction at the time because, he stated, he was unaware that the conviction would have to be reported. However, after receiving advice from a charitable body, Lionheart, he self-reported the matter to RICS on the 4th of February 2026

FINDINGS OF FACT

Included in the bundle was a certified document from Central London Magistrates Court dated the 19th of June 2025 addressed to Mr Vashai Kamle, showing a notice of disqualification from driving for 28 months, and a community order requiring him to undertake 200 hours of unpaid work to be completed within 12 months, for the offences of failing to provide a specimen of breath for analysis and of using a vehicle with no insurance.

I am satisfied that these documents together with Mr Kamel's acceptance of the offences and sentence is sufficient to prove the conviction.

I therefore find the facts as set out in the charge proved

LIABILITY FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

RICS bye-Laws (Updated February 2020) at para 5.2.2 (d) state

“A Member may be liable to disciplinary action under these Bye-Laws, whether or not he was a Member at the time of the occurrence giving rise to that liability, by reason of:

(d) having been convicted of a criminal offence which could result in a custodial sentence.”

The offence of driving or attempting to drive a motor vehicle then failing to supply a specimen for analysis carries a maximum penalty of 26 weeks' imprisonment.

The offence of using a vehicle uninsured against third party risks carries a maximum sentence of an unlimited fine.

Although Mr Kamle did not receive a custodial sentence in this instant, I am satisfied that the facts underlying the conviction and the imposition of a disqualification from driving and 200 hours of unpaid work demonstrate that his conduct is a serious departure from the standards expected of a member of the profession.

I am therefore satisfied that this is a matter which confers liability to disciplinary action

REGULATORY SANCTION

In reaching a decision on sanction I have had regard to the RICS Sanctions Policy: version 9 with effect from 2 February 2022. I have taken account of the overriding principles set out there namely:

- a. The principle of proportionality – the sanction must be proportionate to the breach and all the circumstances.
- b. The need to demonstrate to society and to other Members or Firms that RICS takes firm action in order to protect the public interest and promote regulatory compliance.
- c. The need to act in the public interest by protecting the public, the reputation of the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards.
- d. The necessity to deter the Regulated Member and other Members or Firms from future non-compliance.
- e. Regulatory Sanctions are not intended to be punitive but may have a punitive effect.

I have considered any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.

In terms of aggravating factors, I found the following:

This was a serious offence which could have resulted in a custodial sentence

In terms of mitigating factors, I noted the following:

- Mr Kamle's previous good character both in terms of criminal convictions and RICS disciplinary proceedings.
- Although a serious matter there was no connection between Mr Kamle's actions and his professional practise.
- Although the conviction was not reported promptly nevertheless it did come to the notice of RICS by Mr Kamle's self reporting of the matter
- Mr Kamle completed the unpaid work required by the court promptly.
- Mr Kamel has cooperated with RICS throughout the investigation
- In all his correspondence with RICS Mr Kamle has expressed regret and apologised for his actions. His personal statement displays insight into his actions and the impact of them on the profession
- In his personal statement Mr Kamle says that he has taken actions to prevent a reoccurrence of a matter such as this, including now abstaining from alcohol.
- There were two testimonials from RICS members which attest to his professionalism and integrity when they have dealt with him.

I have considered the available sanctions in ascending order starting with the lowest first.

Caution:

I do not consider a caution would reflect the seriousness of the case

Reprimand:

I consider that the aggravating and mitigating factors are such that a reprimand would be appropriate to reflect the degree to which Mr Kamle's actions have departed from the standard of conduct expected from a member of the profession

I have gone on to consider a fine or the most serious sanction of expulsion for the register to guard against being Unduly lenient, however I am satisfied that in this case a reprimand is both the appropriate and proportionate sanction

ORDER MADE

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, I make the following order:

That Vishal Kamle Membership number 6899712 Be issued with a reprimand.

TAKING EFFECT OF ORDER

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, this order will take effect 14 days from service of the Single Member's decision upon the Regulated Member, unless notification in writing is received from the Regulated Member or RICS stating that they consider that the findings and/or the Regulatory Sanction imposed by the Single Member are wrong

Costs

I have received a schedule of costs from RICS consisting of 20 hours Investigation Time totalling £1500 and Single Member costs of £350. I find that these costs are reasonable

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, I make the following order in respect to costs:

Mr Kamle shall pay costs in the sum of £1850

PUBLICATION

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, the Single Member's record of Decision will be published following the expiry of 14 days from service of the Single Member's Decision upon the Regulated Member.